



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/566,541	01/27/2006	Yuzo Asano	SHG-043P2-319/OSP-19470	5921
26875 7590 02/19/2009 WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, LLP 2700 CAREW TOWER 441 VINE STREET CINCINNATI, OH 45202			EXAMINER HOLLOMAN, NANETTE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1612	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/19/2009 PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/566,541

Applicant(s)

ASANO ET AL.

Examiner

NANNETTE HOLLOMAN

Art Unit

1612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 October 2008.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 7 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 January 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date See Continuation Sheet
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Inventor's Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3. Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :4/16/2008, 4/12/2004, 5/10/2006, 4/27/2006 and 1/27/2006.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I (claims 1-6) in the reply filed on October 13, 2008 is acknowledged.

Claim 7 is withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on October 13, 2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1st Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

1) In claim 6, the description requirement of the patent statute requires a description of an invention, not an indication of a result that one might achieve if one

made that invention. See, e.g., In re Wilder, 22 USPQ 369, 372-3 (Fed. Cir. 1984). (Holding that a claim was not adequately described because the specification did 'little more than outline goals appellants hope the claimed invention achieves and the problems the invention will hopefully ameliorate.')

Mere indistinct terms (such as "derivative" used herein), however, may not suffice to meet the written description requirement. This is particularly true when a compound is claimed in purely functional terms. See Univ. of Rochester v. G.D. Searle, 69 USPQ2d 1886 (CAFC 2004) at 1892, stating:

The appearance of mere indistinct words in a specification or a claim, even an original claim, does not necessarily satisfy that requirement. A description of an anti-inflammatory steroid, i.e., a steroid (a generic structural term) described even in terms of its functioning of lessening inflammation of tissues fails to distinguish any steroid from others having the same activity or function. A description of what a material does, rather than of what it is, usually does not suffice.... The disclosure must allow one skilled in the art to visualize or recognize the identity of the subject matter purportedly described. (Emphasis added).

Conversely, a description of a chemical genus will usually comprise a recitation of structural features common to the members of the genus, which features constitute a substantial portion of the genus. See Univ. of Cal. V. Eli Lilly, 43 USPQ 2d 1398, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997). This is analogous to enablement of a genus under Section 112, ¶ 1, by showing the enablement of a representative number of species within the genus.

A chemical genus can be adequately described if the disclosure presents a sufficient number of representative species that encompass the genus. *If the genus has substantial variance, the disclosure must describe a sufficient number of species to reflect the variation within that genus.* See MPEP 2163. The MPEP lists factors that can be used to determine if sufficient evidence of possession has been furnished in the disclosure of the Application. These include the level of skill and knowledge in the art,

partial structure, physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics alone or coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between structure and function, and the method of making the claimed invention. Disclosure of any *combination of such identifying characteristics that distinguish the claimed invention from other materials* and would lead one of skill in the art to the conclusion that the applicant was in possession of the claimed species is sufficient. MPEP 2163.

Here, the specification does not provide a reasonably representative disclosure of useful "derivatives" generally, a potentially huge genus inclusive of many different compounds having widely divergent structures and functions. Specifically, the specification discloses only a limited number of species at page 11, lines 3-7, and these are not viewed as being reasonably representative of the genus in its claimed scope because no readily apparent combination of identifying characteristics is provided, other than the disclosure of those specific species as examples of the claimed genus.

2) In claim 3, the description requirement of the patent statute requires a description of an invention, not an indication of a result that one might achieve if one made that invention. See, e.g., In re Wilder, 22 USPQ 369, 372-3 (Fed. Cir. 1984). (Holding that a claim was not adequately described because the specification did 'little more than outline goals appellants hope the claimed invention achieves and the problems the invention will hopefully ameliorate.')

Mere indistinct terms (such as "crystal precipitating agent" used herein), however, may not suffice to meet the written description requirement. This is particularly

true when a compound is claimed in purely functional terms. See Univ. of Rochester v. G.D. Searle, 69 USPQ2d 1886 (CAFC 2004) at 1892, stating:

The appearance of mere indistinct words in a specification or a claim, even an original claim, does not necessarily satisfy that requirement. A description of an anti-inflammatory steroid, i.e., a steroid (a generic structural term) described even in terms of its functioning of lessening inflammation of tissues fails to distinguish any steroid from others having the same activity or function. A description of what a material does, rather than of what it is, usually does not suffice.... The disclosure must allow one skilled in the art to visualize or recognize the identity of the subject matter purportedly described. (Emphasis added).

Conversely, a description of a chemical genus will usually comprise a recitation of structural features common to the members of the genus, which features constitute a substantial portion of the genus. See Univ. of Cal. V. Eli Lilly, 43 USPQ 2d 1398, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997). This is analogous to enablement of a genus under Section 112, ¶ 1, by showing the enablement of a representative number of species within the genus.

A chemical genus can be adequately described if the disclosure presents a sufficient number of representative species that encompass the genus. *If the genus has substantial variance, the disclosure must describe a sufficient number of species to reflect the variation within that genus.* See MPEP 2163. The MPEP lists factors that can be used to determine if sufficient evidence of possession has been furnished in the disclosure of the Application. These include the level of skill and knowledge in the art, partial structure, physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics alone or coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between structure and function, and the method of making the claimed invention. Disclosure of any *combination of such identifying characteristics that distinguish the claimed invention from other materials* and would lead one of skill in the art to the conclusion that the applicant was in possession of the claimed species is sufficient. MPEP 2163.

Here, the specification does not provide a reasonably representative disclosure of useful "crystal precipitating agents" generally, a potentially huge genus inclusive of many different compounds having widely divergent structures and functions. Specifically, the specification discloses only a limited number of species at page 8, lines 23-25, and these are not viewed as being reasonably representative of the genus in its claimed scope because no readily apparent combination of identifying characteristics is provided, other than the disclosure of those specific species as examples of the claimed genus.

2nd Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term "derivative" is indefinite because it is unclear how far one can deviate from the parent compound without the "derivative" being so far removed therefrom as to be a completely different compound. See the related rejection in the "Written description" section supra.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

1) Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasuhiko et al. (JP Pub. No. 10-273436, English Translation) in view of Cherukuri et al. (US Patent No. 4,352,825).

Yasuhiko et al. disclose a chewable capsule (paragraph [0007]). Yasuhiko et al. disclose sugars, i.e. D-sorbitol, which give a sweet taste at the time of digestion and is considered to meet the limitation of crystal precipitating agent, in an amount of 120-200 weight sections or parts (paragraph [0014]). Yasuhiko et al. disclose the capsule contains glycerin and sugars at 50 to 250 weight sections to 100 weight section of gelatin (instant claim 2) (paragraph [0015]). Yasuhiko et al. disclose a crystal as part of the coating (paragraph [0019]). Yasuhiko et al. disclose a shell with 0.5 mm thickness (paragraph [0028]). Yasuhiko et al. disclose the capsule is filled 300 mg of a medium-chain-fatty-acid triglyceride, which is being understood to meet the limitation of instant claim 5 (paragraph [0034]).

Yasuhiko et al. do not explicitly disclose the specific outer diameter ranging from 14 mm to 25 mm, the mass of the shell ranging from 10% to 20%, and the quantity of the filling ranging from 1400 mg to 3000 mg as claimed.

Cherukuri et al. disclose a chewing gum comprising a core and an outer shell with varying weight % (column 2, lines 5-15). Cherukuri et al. further disclose the product may take various sizes (column 10, line7).

Cherukuri et al. differ from the instant claims insofar as they do not disclose a specific outer diameter ranging from 14 mm to 25 mm, the mass of the shell ranging

from 10% to 20%, nor the quantity of the filling ranging from 1400 mg to 3000 mg as claimed.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to have varied the sizes of the capsules of the primary reference, since such variations merely represent "general conditions" of capsule size in the chewing gum art which are commonly varied using no more than routine experimentation as shown by the secondary reference. (For example, using a larger capsule would allow more active agent to be delivered per unit dose).

2) Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasuhiko et al. (JP Pub. No. 10-273436, English Translation) in view of Cherukuri et al. (US Patent No. 4,352,825) and further in view of Schoenhard (US Patent Pub. No. 2004/0224020).

Yasuhiko et al. in view of Cherukuri et al. as disclosed above do not disclose a fill substance having a viscosity of not more than 2 Pas at 25° C.

Schoenhard discloses an oral chewable soft gelatin containing a fill (paragraph [0036]). Schoenhard further discloses the fill has a viscosity less than 1000 cP, which is converted to 1Pas (paragraph [0103]). Schoenhard discloses the dosage form represent improved controlled release forms (paragraph [0014]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to use a fill with a viscosity of less than 2 Pas in the capsule of Yasuhiko et al. in view of Cherukuri et al. motivated by the desire to provide an improved controlled release form as disclosed by Schoenhard.

3) Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasuhiko et al. (JP Pub. No. 10-273436, English Translation) in view of Cherukuri et al. (US Patent No. 4,352,825) and further in view of Hermelin et al. (US Patent No. 6,258,846)

Yasuhiko et al. in view of Cherukuri et al. as disclosed above do not disclose a capsule that contains one or more monounsaturated fatty acid having 20 or 22 carbon atoms.

Hermelin et al. disclose a composition with improved nutritional support that may be formed into a chewable dosage form (Abstract, column 13, lines 7-11). Hermelin et al. further disclose a composition containing a monounsaturated fatty acid having 20 to 22 carbon atoms, i.e. mustard seed oil and jojoba (column 11, lines 19-31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to incorporate one or more monounsaturated fatty acid having 20 or 22 carbon atoms in the capsule of Yasuhiko et al. in view of Cherukuri et al. motivated by the desire to form a capsule with improved nutritional support as disclosed by Hermelin et al.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NANNETTE HOLLOMAN whose telephone number is (571) 270-5231. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 800am-500pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frederick Krass can be reached on 571-272-0580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/N. H./
Examiner, Art Unit 1612

/Frederick Krass/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1612